

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

DETAILED ACTION

Oath/Declaration

The Examiner stated that the inventor, Melissa A. DeLong did not sign the Oath/Declaration. Please note that Melissa A. DeLong did sign the Declaration at the top of page 3, I have attached a copy. I have also attached a copy of the Corrected Filing Receipt dated 03/06/2006 listing Melissa A. DeLong as an inventor.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiners stated that claims 34 and 49-54 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant thanks the Examiner for such allowable subject matter.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

The Examiner claims 1-16, 19, 21, 22, 24, 27-33, 35-48, and 55-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent 6,553,108 (hereinafter referred to as “Felger”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reasons stated below.

As stated in MPEP § 2131, “A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Applicants respectfully submit, as will be detailed below, that Felger does not, either expressly or inherently, teach or suggest many limitations recited in the pending claims. For example, Applicant does not believe that Felger discloses matching the data representing the at least one unique identifier with data representing at least one further identifier associated previously with the given conference call host. Figs. 1 and 4, as well as col. 14, lines 37-48 do

not appear to delineate between matching a unique identifier with another identifier previously associated with a conference host.

However, purely in the interest of expediting the prosecution of the instant invention, Applicant has amended the independent claims to include the following limitation: connecting the given conference call host directly to the given conference call which includes bypassing entry of at least one conference pass code by the given conference call host. This limitation originally appeared in claim 34 which the Examiner found to be in condition for allowance. As such, Applicant believes the independent claims, as well as the claims that depend from them, are in condition for allowance and respectfully request they be passed to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,
WEST CORPORATION

Date: June 19, 2008

By: /Raffi Gostanian/
Raffi Gostanian
Reg. No. 42,595
Tel: (972) 849-1310

11808 Miracle Hills Drive
Omaha, Nebraska 68154
(402) 965-7077